# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

#### 2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

#### FOR:

#### **Indiana OIC State Council**

| DOCUMENT ANALYSIS    | OBSERVATION          |              | COMPLIANCE           |  |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--|
|                      | Lesson matches       |              | Criminal Background  |  |
| Tutor Qualifications | original description | Satisfactory | Checks               |  |
|                      |                      |              | Health/safety laws & |  |
| Recruiting Materials | Instruction is clear | Satisfactory | regulations          |  |
|                      | Time on task is      |              |                      |  |
| Academic Program     | appropriate          | Satisfactory | Financial viability  |  |
|                      | Instructor is        |              |                      |  |
|                      | appropriately        |              |                      |  |
| Progress Reporting   | knowledgeable        | Satisfactory |                      |  |
|                      | Student/instructor   |              |                      |  |
|                      | ratio: 1:1           | Satisfactory |                      |  |

### **ACTION NEEDED:** NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since IN OIC's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

## **On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components**

NAME OF PROVIDER: IN OIC State Council

SITE: 2855 N. Keystone Avenue IN OIC Offices

DATE: March 21, 2007

REVIEWERS: MC/ST

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): J.M.

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 5:30 PM

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1** 

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

| COMPONENT                                 | S | U | REVIEWER COMMENTS  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   |   | Student worked on mathematics lesson with the help of a tutor. There were many books,  |
|   |   |   | manipulatives, and papers on the table. The student did some work independently on a worksheet   |
|   |   |   | and some work with the help of the tutor. The tutor corrected answers on the worksheet together  |
|   |   |   | with the student, and the tutor took time to do some extra practice with concepts that were difficult  |
|   |   |   | for the student. The tutor tried to make the student answer questions on his own and gave tips, hints,   |
|   |   |   | and strategies to help the student come to the correct answer. It was not apparent how the lesson  |
| Lesson matches original description in    |   |   | plan was devised for the student or how the tutor decided what to work on with the student, although   |
| provider application                      | X |   | the tutor did implement multiple strategies to ensure that the student understood concepts.  |
|   |   |   | Instructor appeared to be very familiar with the student's academic level and with his learning style.   |
|   |   |   | The student appeared to know what was expected of him and how to proceed through the lesson.   |
|   |   |   | When the student had trouble understanding concepts, the tutor employed multiple strategies to help  |
| Instruction is clear                      | X |   | the student master the concept.  |
| Time on task is appropriate               | X |   | The student remained constantly on task and appeared to be very engaged in the lesson.   |
|   |   |   | Again, the instructor appeared to be knowledgeable of the student's learning style and of his  |
|   |   |   | academic level. The tutor generally ensured that the student understood the concept (e.g., of mixed  |
|   |   |   | numbers and fractions) before moving on to a new concept. It was not always apparent how the   |
|   |   |   | lesson plan was devised for the student (i.e., it appeared that the student had begun the lesson   |
| Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable |   |   | working on English/Language Arts and then was working on mathematics; however, the lesson did  |
|   | X |   | appear to be tailored toward the student's needs).   |
| Ct. Lond/matet.matic1.1                   | v |   | The state of all to 10 th all t |
| Student/instructor ratio: 1:1             | X |   | The student worked individually with the tutor, 1:1.   |